arXiv:1605.00445v1 [math.NA] 2 May 2016

# Setup of Order Conditions for Splitting Methods

Winfried Auzinger[1], Wolfgang Herfort[1], Harald Hofstätter[1], and Othmar Koch[2]

[1] Technische Universität Wien, Austria
w.auzinger@tuwien.ac.at, w.herfort@tuwien.ac.at,
hofi@harald-hofstaetter.at,
www.asc.tuwien.ac.at/~winfried, www.asc.tuwien.ac.at/~herfort,
www.harald-hofstaetter.at
[2] Universität Wien, Austria
othmar@othmar-koch.org,
www.othmar-koch.org

**Abstract.** This article is based on [1] and [2], where an approach based on Taylor expansion and the structure of its leading term as an element of a free Lie algebra was described for the setup of a system of order conditions for operator splitting methods. Along with a brief review of these materials and some theoretical background, we discuss the implementation of the ideas from these papers in computer algebra, in particular using[3] Maple 18. A parallel version of such a code is described.

**Keywords:** Evolution equations, splitting methods, order conditions, local error, Taylor expansion, parallel processing

## 1 Introduction

The construction of higher order discretization schemes of one-step type for the numerical solution of evolution equations is typically based on the setup and solution of a large system of polynomial equations for a number of unknown coefficients. Classical examples are Runge-Kutta methods, and their various modifications, see e.g. [9].

To design particular schemes, we need to understand

(i) how to generate a system of algebraic equations for the coefficients sought,
(ii) how to solve the resulting system of polynomial equations.

Here, we focus on (i) which depends on the particular class of methods one is interested in. We consider *splitting methods,* which are based on the idea of approximating the exact flow of an evolution equation by compositions based on (usually two) separate subflows which are easier to evaluate.

Computer algebra is an indispensable tool for solving such a problem, and there are different algorithmic approaches. In general there is a tradeoff between 'manual' a priori analysis and machine driven automatization.

[3] Maple is a trademark of MapleSoft$^{TM}$.

For splitting methods, a well-known approach is based on recursive application of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff (BCH) formula, see [8]. Instead, we follow another approach based on Taylor expansion and a theoretical result concerning the structure of the leading term in this expansion. This has the advantage that explicit knowledge of the BCH-coefficients is not required. Moreover, our approach adapts easily to splitting into more than two parts, and even to pairs of splitting schemes akin to Runge-Kutta methods.

Topic (ii) is not discussed in this paper. Details concerning the theoretical background and a discussion concerning concrete results and optimized schemes obtained are given in [2], and a collection of optimized schemes can be found at [3]. We note that a related approach has recently also been considered in [5].

### 1.1 Splitting methods for the integration of evolution equations

In many applications, the right hand side $F(u)$ of an evolution equation

$$\partial_t u(t) = F(u(t)) = A(u(t)) + B(u(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad u(0) \text{ given}, \tag{1}$$

splits up in a natural way into two terms $A(u)$ and $B(u)$, where the separate integration of the subproblems

$$\partial_t u(t) = A(u(t)), \qquad \partial_t u(t) = B(u(t))$$

is much easier to accomplish than for the original problem.

*Example 1.* The solution of a linear ODE system with constant coefficients,

$$\partial_t u(t) = (A + B)\, u(t),$$

is given by

$$u(t) = e^{t(A+B)}\, u(0).$$

The simplest splitting approximation ('Lie-Trotter'), starting at some initial value $u$ and applied with a time step of length $t = h$, is given by

$$\mathcal{S}(h, u) = e^{hB}\, e^{hA}\, u \approx e^{h(A+B)} u.$$

This is not exact (unless $AB = BA$), but it satisfies

$$\|(e^{hB}\, e^{hA} - e^{h(A+B)})u\| = \mathcal{O}(h^2) \quad \text{for} \quad h \to 0,$$

and the error of this approximation depends on behavior of the commutator $[A, B] = AB - BA$. □

A general splitting method takes steps of the form[4]

$$\mathcal{S}(h, u) = \mathcal{S}_s(h, \mathcal{S}_{s-1}(h, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_1(h, u))) \approx \phi_F(h, u), \tag{2a}$$

[4] By $\Phi_F$ we denote the flow associated with the equation $\partial_t u = F(u)$, and $\Phi_A$, $\Phi_B$ are defined analogously.

with

$$\mathcal{S}_j(h,v) = \phi_B(b_j\,h, \phi_A(a_j\,h, v)), \tag{2b}$$

where the (real or complex) coefficients $a_j, b_j$ have to be found such that a certain desired order of approximation for $h \to 0$ is obtained.

The local error of a splitting step is denoted by

$$\mathcal{S}(h,u) - \phi_F(h,u) =: \mathcal{L}(h,u). \tag{3}$$

For our present purpose of finding asymptotic order conditions it is sufficient to consider the case of a linear system, $F(u) = F\,u = A\,u + B\,u$ with linear operators $A$ and $B$. We denote

$$A_j = a_j\,A,\ B_j = b_j\,B, \quad j = 1 \ldots s.$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{S}(h,u) = \mathcal{S}(h)u, \quad \mathcal{S}(h) = \mathcal{S}_s(h)\,\mathcal{S}_{s-1}(h) \cdots \mathcal{S}_1(h) \approx e^{hF}, \tag{4a}$$

with

$$\mathcal{S}_j(h) = e^{hB_j}\,e^{hA_j}, \quad j = 1 \ldots s. \tag{4b}$$

For the linear case the local error (3) is of the form $\mathcal{L}(h)u$ with the linear operator $\mathcal{L}(h) = \mathcal{S}(h) - e^{hF}$.

### 1.2 Commutators

Commutators of the involved operators play a central role. For formal consistency, we call $A$ and $B$ the 'commutators of degree 1'. There is (up to sign) one non-vanishing[5] commutator of degree 2,

$$[A,B] := A\,B - B\,A,$$

and there are two non-vanishing commutators of degree 3,

$$[A,[A,B]] = A\,[A,B] - [A,B]\,A, \quad [[A,B],B] = [A,B]\,B - B\,[A,B],$$

and so on; see Section 2.2 for commutators of higher degrees.

## 2 Taylor expansion of the local error

### 2.1 Representation of Taylor coefficients

Consider the Taylor expansion, about $h = 0$, of the local error operator $\mathcal{L}(h)$ of a consistent one-step method (satisfying the basic consistency condition $\mathcal{L}(0) = 0$),

$$\mathcal{L}(h) = \sum_{q=1}^{p} \frac{h^q}{q!}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}^q}{\mathrm{d}h^q}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} + \mathcal{O}(h^{p+1}). \tag{5}$$

[5] 'Non-vanishing' means non-vanishing in general (generic case, with no special assumptions on $A$ and $B$).

The method is of asymptotic order $p$ iff $\mathcal{L}(h) = \mathcal{O}(h^{p+1})$ for $h \to 0$; thus the conditions for order $\geq p$ are given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}h}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = \ \ldots\ = \frac{\mathrm{d}^p}{\mathrm{d}h^p}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = 0. \tag{6}$$

The formulas in (6) need to be presented in a more explicit form, involving the operators $A$ and $B$. For a splitting method (4), a calculation based on the Leibniz formula for higher derivatives shows[6] (see [2])

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^q}{\mathrm{d}h^q}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = \sum_{|\boldsymbol{k}|=q} \binom{q}{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=s\ldots1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k_j} \binom{k_j}{\ell}\, B_j^{\ell}\, A_j^{k_j-\ell} \ - \ (A+B)^q, \tag{7}$$

with $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$.

*Representation of* (7) *in Maple.* The non-commuting operators $A$ and $B$ are represented by symbolic variables `A` and `B`, which can be declared to be non-commutative making use of the corresponding feature implemented in the package `Physics`. Now it is straightforward to generate the sum (7), with unspecified coefficients $a_j, b_j$, using standard combinatorial tools; for details see Section 3.

### 2.2 The leading term of the local error expansion

Formally, the multinomial sums in the expressions (7) are multivariate homogeneous polynomials of total degree $q$ in the variables $a_j, b_j$, $j = 1 \ldots s$, and the coefficients of these polynomials are power products of total degree $q$ composed of powers of the non-commutative symbols $A$ and $B$.

*Example 2 (*[2]*).* For $s = 2$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}h}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} &= (a_1+a_2)\,A + (b_1+b_2)\,B \ - \ (A+B),\\
\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}h^2}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} &= ((a_1+a_2)^2)\,A^2 + (2\,a_2\,b_1)\,A\,B\\
&\quad + (2\,a_1\,b_1 + 2\,a_1\,b_2 + 2\,a_2\,b_2)\,B\,A + ((b_1+b_2)^2)\,B^2\\
&\quad - \ (A^2 + A\,B + B\,A + B^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The consistency condition for order $p \geq 1$ reads $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}h}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\big|_{h=0} = 0$, which is equivalent to $a_1 + a_2 = 1$ and $b_1 + b_2 = 1$.

At first sight, for order $p \geq 2$ we need 4, or (at second sight) 2 additional equations to be satisfied, such that $\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}h^2}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\big|_{h=0} = 0$. However, assuming that the conditions for order $p \geq 1$ are satisfied, the second derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}h^2}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\big|_{h=0}$ simplifies to the commutator expression

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}h^2}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = (2\,a_2\,b_1 - 1)\,[A,B],$$

[6] If $A$ and $B$ commute, i.e., $AB = BA$, then all these expressions vanish.

giving the single additional condition $2\,a_2\,b_1 = 1$ for order $p \geq 2$. Assuming now that $a_1, a_2$ and $b_1, b_2$ are chosen such that all conditions for $p \geq 2$ are satisfied, the third derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}^3}{\mathrm{d}h^3}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\big|_{h=0}$, which now represents the leading term of the local error, simplifies to a linear combination of the commutators $[A,[A,B]]$ and $[[A,B],B]$, of degree 3, namely

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^3}{\mathrm{d}h^3}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = (3\,a_2^2\,b_1 - 1)\,[A,[A,B]] + (3\,a_2\,b_1^2 - 1)\,[[A,B],B]. \qquad \square$$

*Remark 1.* The classical second-order Strang splitting method corresponds to the choice $a_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, $b_1 = 1$, $a_2 = \frac{1}{2}$, $b_2 = 0$, or $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, $a_2 = 1$, $b_2 = \frac{1}{2}$.

The observation from this simple example generalizes as follows:

**Proposition 1.** *The leading term* $\frac{\mathrm{d}^{p+1}}{\mathrm{d}h^{p+1}}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\big|_{h=0}$ *of the Taylor expansion of the local error* $\mathcal{L}(h)$ *of a splitting method of order* $p$ *is a Lie element, i.e., it is a linear combination of commutators of degree* $p+1$.

*Proof.* See [1,8]. $\square$

*Example 3.* Assume that the coefficients $a_j, b_j$, $j = 1 \ldots s$ have been found such that the associated splitting scheme is of order $p \geq 3$ (this necessitates $s \geq 3$). This means that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}h}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = \frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}h^2}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = \frac{\mathrm{d}^3}{\mathrm{d}h^3}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = 0,$$

and from Proposition 1 we know that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^4}{\mathrm{d}h^4}\,\mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = \gamma_1\,[A,[A,[A,B]]] + \gamma_2\,[A,[[A,B],B]] + \gamma_3\,[[[[A,B],B],B]$$

holds, with certain coefficients $\gamma_k$ depending on the $a_j$ and $b_j$. Here we have made use of the fact that there are three independent commutators of degree 4 in $A$ and $B$. $\square$

Targeting for higher-order methods one needs to know a *basis of commutators* up to a certain degree. The answer to this question is known, and a full set of independent commutators of degree $q$ can be represented by a set of words of length $q$ over the alphabet $\{A, B\}$. A prominent example is the set of *Lyndon-Shirshov words* (see [6]) displayed in Table 1. A combinatorial algorithm due to Duval [7] can be used to generate this table.

Here, for instance, the word `AABBB` represents the commutator

$$[A,[[[A,B],B],B]] = \\ A^2B^3 - 3ABAB^2 + 3AB^2AB - 2AB^3A + 3BAB^2A - 3B^2ABA + B^3A^2,$$

with leading power product $A^2B^3 = AABBB$ (w.r.t. lexicographical order).

| $q$ | $L_q$ | Lyndon-Shirshov words over the alphabet $\{\mathtt{A}, \mathtt{B}\}$ |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | `A`, `B` |
| 2 | 1 | `AB` |
| 3 | 2 | `AAB`, `ABB` |
| 4 | 3 | `AAAB`, `AABB`, `ABBB` |
| 5 | 6 | `AAAAB`, `AAABB`, `AABAB`, `AABBB`, `ABABB`, `ABBBB` |
| 6 | 9 | `AAAAAB`, `AAAABB`, `AAABAB`, `AAABBB`, `AABABB`, `AABBAB`, `AABBBB`, `ABABBB`, `ABBBBB` |
| 7 | 18 | ... |
| 8 | 30 | ... |
| 9 | 56 | ... |
| 10 | 99 | ... |
| ⋮ | ⋮ | ⋱ |

**Table 1.** $L_q$ is the number of words of length $q$.

### 2.3 The algorithm: implicit recursive elimination

On the basis of Proposition 1, and with a table of Lyndon-Shirshov words available, we can build up a set of conditions for order $\geq p$ for a splitting method with $s$ stages in the following way (recall the notation $A_j := a_j\, A$, $B_j = b_j\, B$):

*For $q = 1 \ldots p$:*

- *Generate the symbolic expressions* (7) *in the indeterminate coefficients $a_j, b_j$ and the non-commutative variables* `A` *and* `B`.
- *Extract the coefficients of the power products (of degree $q$) represented by all Lyndon-Shirshov words of length $q$, resulting in a set of $L_q$ polynomials $P_{q,k}(a_j, b_j)$ of degree $q$ in the coefficients $a_j$ and $b_j$.*

The resulting set of $\sum_{q=1}^{p} L_q$ multivariate polynomial equations

$$P_{q,k}(a_j, b_j) = 0, \quad k = 1 \ldots L_q, \quad q = 1 \ldots p \tag{8}$$

represents the desired conditions for order $p$.

We call this procedure *implicit recursive elimination,* because the equations generated in this way are correct in an 'a posteriori' sense (cf. Example 2):

- For $q = 1$, the basic consistency equations

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1,1}(a_j, b_j) &= a_1 + \ldots + a_s - 1 = 0, \\ P_{1,2}(a_j, b_j) &= b_1 + \ldots + b_s - 1 = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{9a}$$

  are obtained.
- *Assume* that (9a) is satisfied. Then, due to Proposition 1, the additional (quadratic) equation (note that $L_2 = 1$)

$$P_{2,1}(a_j, b_j) = 0, \tag{9b}$$

  represents one additional condition for a scheme of order $p = 2$.

– *Assume* that (9a) and (9b) are satisfied. Then, due to Proposition 1, the additional (cubic) equations (note that $L_3 = 2$)

$$P_{3,1}(a_j, b_j) = P_{3,2}(a_j, b_j) = 0, \tag{9c}$$

represent two additional conditions for a scheme of order $p = 3$.
– The process is continued in the same manner.

If we (later) find a solution $\{a_j, b_j,\ j = 1 \dots s\}$ of the resulting system

$$(8) = \{(9a), (9b), (9c), \dots\}$$

of multivariate polynomial equations, this means that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(9a) is satisfied} &\ \Rightarrow\ \text{condition (9b) is correct,} \\ \text{(9b) is also satisfied} &\ \Rightarrow\ \text{condition (9c) is correct,} \end{aligned}$$

and so on. By induction we conclude that the whole procedure is correct. See [2] for a more detailed exposition of this argument.

*Remark 2.* In addition, it makes sense to generate the additional conditions for order $p + 1$. Even if we do not solve for these conditions, they represent the leading term of the local error, and this can be used to search for optimized solutions for order $p$, where the coefficients in $\frac{\mathrm{d}^{p+1}}{\mathrm{d}h^{p+1}} \mathcal{L}(h) \big|_{h=0}$ become minimal in size.

## 3 A parallel implementation

In our Maple code, a table of Lyndon-Shirshov words up to a fixed length (corresponding to the maximal order aimed for; see Table 1) is included as static data. The procedure `Order_conditions` displayed below generates a set of order conditions using the algorithm described in Section 2.3.

– Fist of all, we activate the package `Physics` and declare the symbols `A` and `B` as non-commutative.
– For organizing the multinomial expansion according to (7) we use standard functions from the packages `combinat` and `combstruct`.
– The number of terms during each stage rapidly increases as more stages are to be computed. Therefore we have implemented a parallel version based on the package `Grid`. Parallelization is taken into account as follows:
  • On a multi-core processor[7], all threads execute the same code. Each thread identifies itself via a call to `MyNode()`, and this is used to control execution. Communication between the threads is realized via message passing.
  • Thread 0 is the master thread controlling the overall execution.

[7] E.g., on an Intel i7 processor, 6 cores are available. The hyper-threading feature enables the use of 12 parallel threads.

- For $q = 1 \ldots p$:
  - Each of the working threads generates symbolic expressions of the form (recall $A_j = a_j\, A$, $B_j = b_j\, B$)

$$\Pi_{\boldsymbol{k}} := \binom{q}{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=s\ldots 1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k_j} \binom{k_j}{\ell} B_j^{\ell}\, A_j^{k_j-\ell}, \quad \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s,$$

    appearing in the sum (7). Here the work is equidistributed over the threads, i.e., each of them generates a subset of $\{\Pi_{\boldsymbol{k}},\ \boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^s\}$ in parallel.
  - For each of these expressions $\Pi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, the coefficients of all Lyndon-Shirshov monomials of degree $q$ are computed, and the according subsets of coefficients are summed up in parallel.
  - Finally, the master thread 0 sums up the results received from all the working threads. This results in the set of multivariate polynomials representing the order conditions at level $q$.

– The Maple code displayed below is, to some extent, to be read as pseudo-code. For simplicity of presentation we have ignored some technicalities, e.g., concerning the proper indexing of combinatorial tupels, etc. The original, working code is available from the authors.

```
> with(combinat)
> with(combstruct)
> with(Grid)
> with(Physics)
>  Setup(noncommutativeprefix={A,B})

> Order_conditions := proc()
  global p,s,OC,    # I/O parameters via global variables
         Lyndon     # assume that table of Lyndon monomials is available
  this_thread := MyNode()   # each thread identifies itself
  max_threads := NumNodes() # number of available threads
  for j from 1 to s do
      A_j[j] := a[j]*A
      B_j[j] := b[j]*B
      term[-1][j] := 1
  end do
  OC=[0$p]
  for q from 1 to p do
    if this_thread>0 then  # working threads start computing
                           # master thread 0 is waiting
       Mn := allstructs(Composition(q+2),size=2)
       for j from 1 to s do
           term[q-1][j] := 0
           for mn from 1 to nops(Mn) do
               term[q-1][j] :=
                 term[q-1][j] +
                   multinomial(q,Mn[mn])*B_j[j]^Mn[mn][2]*A_j[j]^Mn[mn][1]
```

```
          end do
       end do
       k := iterstructs(Composition(q+s),size=s)
       OC_q_this_thread := [0$nops(Lyndon[q])]
       while not finished(k) do # generate expansion (7) term by term
         Ms := nextstruct(k)
         if get_active(this_thread) then # get_active:
                                         #   auxiliary Boolean function
                                         #   for equidistributing workload
           Pi_k := 1
           for j from s to 1 by -1 do
               Pi_k := Pi_k*term[Ms[j]-1][j]
           end do
           Pi_k := multinomial(q,Ms)*expand(Pi_k)
           OC_q_this_thread := # compare coefficients of Lyndon monomials
             OC_q_this_thread +
               [seq(coeff(Pi_k,Lyndon[q][l]),l=1..nops(Lyndon[q]))]
         end if
       end do
       Send(0,OC_q_this_thread) # send partial sum to master thread
    else # master thread 0 receives and sums up
         #   partial results from working threads
       OC[q] := [(-1)$nops(Lyndon[q])] # initialize sum
       for i_thread from 1 to max_threads-1 do
           OC[q] := OC[q] + Receive(i_thread)
       end do
    end if
end do
end proc

> # Example:
> p := 4
> s := 4
> Launch(Order_conditions,imports=["p","s"],exports=["OC"])  # run

> OC[1]
  [a[1]+a[2]+a[3]+a[4]-1,
   b[1]+b[2]+b[3]+b[4]-1]

> OC[2]
  [2*a[2]*b[1]+2*a[3]*b[1]+2*a[3]*b[2]
   +2*a[4]*b[1]+2*a[4]*b[2]+2*a[4]*b[3]-1]

> OC[3]
  [3*a[2]^2*b[1]+6*a[2]*a[3]*b[1]+6*a[2]*a[4]*b[1]
   +3*a[3]^2*b[1]+3*a[3]^2*b[2]+6*a[3]*a[4]*b[1]+6*a[3]*a[4]*b[2]
    +3*a[4]^2*b[1]+3*a[4]^2*b[2]+3*a[4]^2*b[3]-1,
   3*a[2]*b[1]^2+3*a[3]*b[1]^2+6*a[3]*b[1]*b[2]
    +3*a[3]*b[2]^2+3*a[4]*b[1]^2+6*a[4]*b[1]*b[2]+6*a[4]*b[1]*b[3]
     +3*a[4]*b[2]^2+6*a[4]*b[2]*b[3]+3*a[4]*b[3]^2-1]
```

```
> OC[4]
  [4*a[2]^3*b[1]+12*a[2]^2*a[3]*b[1]+12*a[2]^2*a[4]*b[1]
   +12*a[2]*a[3]^2*b[1]+24*a[2]*a[3]*a[4]*b[1]+12*a[2]*a[4]^2*b[1]
    +4*a[3]^3*b[1]+4*a[3]^3*b[2]+12*a[3]^2*a[4]*b[1]
     +12*a[3]^2*a[4]*b[2]+12*a[3]*a[4]^2*b[1]+12*a[3]*a[4]^2*b[2]
      +4*a[4]^3*b[1]+4*a[4]^3*b[2]+4*a[4]^3*b[3]-1,
   6*a[2]^2*b[1]^2+12*a[2]*a[3]*b[1]^2+12*a[2]*a[4]*b[1]^2
    +6*a[3]^2*b[1]^2+12*a[3]^2*b[1]*b[2]+6*a[3]^2*b[2]^2
     +12*a[3]*a[4]*b[1]^2+24*a[3]*a[4]*b[1]*b[2]+12*a[3]*a[4]*b[2]^2
      +6*a[4]^2*b[1]^2+12*a[4]^2*b[1]*b[2]+12*a[4]^2*b[1]*b[3]
       +6*a[4]^2*b[2]^2+12*a[4]^2*b[2]*b[3]+6*a[4]^2*b[3]^2-1,
   4*a[2]*b[1]^3+4*a[3]*b[1]^3+12*a[3]*b[1]^2*b[2]
    +12*a[3]*b[1]*b[2]^2+4*a[3]*b[2]^3+4*a[4]*b[1]^3
     +12*a[4]*b[1]^2*b[2]+12*a[4]*b[1]^2*b[3]+12*a[4]*b[1]*b[2]^2
      +24*a[4]*b[1]*b[2]*b[3]+12*a[4]*b[1]*b[3]^2+4*a[4]*b[2]^3
       +12*a[4]*b[2]^2*b[3]+12*a[4]*b[2]*b[3]^2+4*a[4]*b[3]^3-1]
```

For practical use some further tools have been developed, e.g. for generating tables of polynomial coefficients for further use, e.g., by numerical software other than Maple. This latter job can also be parallelized.

### 3.1 Special cases

Some special cases are of interest:

- *Symmetric schemes* are characterized by the property $\mathcal{S}(-h, \mathcal{S}(h, u)) = u$. Here, either $a_1 = 0$ or $b_s = 0$, and the remaining coefficient sets $(a_j)$ and $(b_j)$ are palindromic. Symmetric schemes have an even order $p$, and the order conditions for even orders need not be included; see [8]. Thus, we use a special ansatz and generate a reduced set of equations.
- *Palindromic schemes* were introduced in [2] and characterized by the property $\mathcal{S}(-h, \check{\mathcal{S}}(h, u)) = u$, where $\check{\mathcal{S}}$ denotes the scheme $\mathcal{S}$ with the role of $A$ and $B$ interchanged. In this case, the full coefficient set

  $$(a_1, b_1, \ldots, a_s, b_s)$$

  is palindromic. As for symmetric schemes, this means that a special ansatz is used, and again it is sufficient to generate a reduced set of equations, see [2].

Apart from these modifications, the basic algorithm remains unchanged.

## 4 Modifications and extensions

### 4.1 Splitting into more than two operators

Our algorithm directly generalizes to the case of splitting into more than two operators. Consider evolution equations where the right-hand side splits into

three parts,

$$\partial_t u(t) = F(u(t)) = A(u(t)) + B(u(t)) + C(u(t)), \tag{10}$$

and associated splitting schemes,

$$\mathcal{S}(h,u) = \mathcal{S}_s(h, \mathcal{S}_{s-1}(h, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_1(h,u))) \approx \phi_F(h,u), \tag{11a}$$

with

$$\mathcal{S}_j(h,v) = \phi_C(c_j\, h, \phi_B(b_j\, h, \phi_A(a_j\, h, v))), \tag{11b}$$

see [4]. Here the linear representation (7) generalizes as follows, with $A_j = a_j\, A$, $B_j = b_j\, B$, $C_j = c_j\, C$, and $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}_0^s$, $\boldsymbol{\ell} = (\ell_A, \ell_B, \ell_C) \in \mathbb{N}_0^3$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^q}{\mathrm{d}h^q}\, \mathcal{L}(h)\,\Big|_{h=0} = \sum_{|\boldsymbol{k}|=q} \binom{q}{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=s\ldots 1} \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\ell}|=k_j} \binom{k_j}{\boldsymbol{\ell}} C_j^{\ell_C}\, B_j^{\ell_B}\, A_j^{\ell_A} \;-\; (A+B+C)^q. \tag{12}$$

On the basis of these identities, the algorithm from Section 2.3 generalizes in a straightforward way. The Lyndon basis representing independent commutators now corresponds to Lyndon words over the alphabet $\{\mathtt{A}, \mathtt{B}, \mathtt{C}\}$, see [2]. Concerning special cases (symmetries etc.) and parallelization, similar considerations as before apply.

### 4.2 Pairs of splitting schemes

For the purpose of adaptive time-splitting algorithms, the construction of (optimized) pairs of schemes of orders $(p, p+1)$ is favorable. Generating a respective set of order conditions can also be accomplished by a modification of our code; the difference lies in the fact that some coefficients are chosen a priori (corresponding to a given method of order $p+1$), but apart from this the generation of order conditions for an associated scheme of order $p$ works analogously as before. Finding optimal schemes is then accomplished by tracing a large set of possible solutions; see [2].

*Acknowledgements.* This work was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grant P24157-N13, and by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) under grant MA-14-002.

Computational results based on the ideas in this work have been achieved in part using the Vienna Scientific Cluster (VSC).

## References

1. Auzinger, W., Herfort, W.: Local error structures and order conditions in terms of Lie elements for exponential splitting schemes. Opuscula Math. 34, 243–255 (2014)
2. Auzinger, W., Hofstätter, H., Ketcheson, D., Koch, O.: Practical splitting methods for the adaptive integration of nonlinear evolution equations. Part I: Construction of optimized schemes and pairs of schemes. ASC Report No. 25/2015, TU Wien, (2015); submitted.

3. Auzinger, W., Koch, O.: Coefficients of various splitting methods. At `www.asc.tuwien.ac.at/~winfried/splitting/`.
4. Auzinger, W., Koch, O., Thalhammer, M.: Defect-based local error estimators for high-order splitting methods involving three linear operators. Numer. Algorithms 70, 61–91 (2015)
5. Blanes S., Casas, F., Farrés, A., Laskar, J., Makazaga, J., A. Murua, A.: New families of symplectic splitting methods for numerical integration in dynamical astronomy. Appl. Numer. Math. 68, 58–72 (2013)
6. Bokut, L., Sbitneva, L., Shestakov, I.: Lyndon-Shirshov words, Gröbner-Shirshov bases, and free Lie algebras. In 'Non-Associative Algebra and Its Applications', Chapter 3. Chapman & Hall / CRC, Boca Raton, Fl. (2006)
7. Duval, J.P.: Géneration d'une section des classes de conjugaison et arbre des mots de Lyndon de longueur bornée. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 60, 255–283 (1988)
8. Hairer, E., Lubich, C., Wanner, G.: *Geometric Numerical Integration.* 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 2006.
9. Ketcheson, D., MacDonald, C., Ruuth, S.: Spatially partitioned embedded Runge-Kutta methods. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 51, 2887–2910 (2013)